

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached "Replacement Sheet" of drawings includes changes to Figure 2. The attached "Replacement Sheet", which includes Figure 2, replaces the original sheets including Figure 2.

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 30 are pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

DRAWINGS

The drawings stand objected to because the reference character 24 has been used to designate both an upper edge and a slot. The specification has been amended herein whereby the reference character 24 is used to solely designate the slot. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

Additionally, Figure 2 has been amended herein to more accurately depict the relationship between the resonance frequency diffusion (RFD) reliefs (52) and the inner panel (14). The amendments to Figure 2 are supported in the specification and drawings as originally filed. No new matter has been entered.

SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to for certain informalities. Applicants have amended the specification according to the Examiner's suggestions. More specifically, paragraph [0027] has been amended to include "a pressure sensitive strip", consistent with the rest of the application as filed. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

The specification has further been amended such that the reference character 24 solely designates the slot. More specifically, paragraph [0023] has been amended to remove the reference number 24 following “upper edge”.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1 – 24, 26 and 28 stand objected to for certain informalities.

Claim 1 stands objected to because the term “said assembly” should be changed to “said door assembly”. Claim 1 has been amended according to the Examiner’s suggestion and reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

Claim 8 stands objected to for the recitation of “said panel assembly”. Claim 8 has been amended to recite “said exterior panel”. Proper antecedent basis is provided in claim 1. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

Claim 12 stands objected to because the term “said assembly” should be changed to “said vehicle panel assembly”. Claim 12 has been amended according to the Examiner’s suggestion and reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

Claim 26 stands objected to because the term “said material” should be changed to “said semi-rigid moisture barrier material”. Claim 26 has been amended according to the Examiner’s suggestion and reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection are respectfully requested.

Claim 28 stands rejected to because there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "said deposited material". Claim 28 has been amended herein to depend from claim 27, which provides proper antecedent basis.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 25 – 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Beaulat (U.S. Pat. No. 5,595,415). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 25 includes a body of semi-rigid moisture barrier material having a relief pattern arranged to diffuse sound waves directed toward the barrier panel. More specifically, the relief pattern includes a pattern of valleys and protrusions formed in the semi-rigid moisture barrier material.

Beaulat fails to teach or suggest a relief pattern arranged to diffuse sound waves directed toward said barrier panel. More specifically, Beaulat discloses a composite lining (3) including first and second panels (3a) and (3b), respectively. Although the Examiner has asserted that Beaulat discloses a relief pattern (6), Beaulat actually discloses a cavity (6), which is a hole defined between the first and second panels (3a) and (3b). The cavity (6) can be filled with an energy absorbing material (6a). Beaulat does not include any discussion regarding a relief pattern or a relief pattern arranged to diffuse sound waves directed toward a barrier panel. Unlike Beaulat, the present invention does not include a hole. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claim 26 – 30 each ultimately depend from claim 25, which defines over the prior art, as discussed in detail above. Therefore, claims 26 – 30 also define over the prior art and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 – 5, 7, 8, 10 – 18, 20, 21, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koa et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,412,852) in view of Beulat (U.S. Pat. No. 5,595,415). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 12 each include a plurality of resonance frequency diffusion (RFD) reliefs formed in a semi-rigid barrier sheet that diffuse sound waves directed toward the semi-rigid barrier sheet.

The Office Action at page 5 state that Koa et al. fails to teach or suggest a plurality of RFD reliefs formed in a semi-rigid barrier sheet that diffuse sound waves directed toward the semi-rigid barrier sheet. Beulat fails to cure the deficient teachings of Koa et al. as discussed in detail above, Beulat discloses a composite lining (3) including first and second panels (3a) and (3b), respectively. Although the Examiner has asserted that Beulat discloses a relief pattern (6), Beulat actually discloses a cavity (6), which is a hole defined between the first and second panels (3a) and (3b). The cavity (6) can be filled with an energy absorbing material (6a). Beulat does not include any discussion regarding a relief pattern or a relief pattern arranged to diffuse sound waves directed toward a barrier panel. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 2 – 7, 8, 10, 11, 13 – 18, 20, 21, 23 and 24 each ultimately depend from one of claims 1 and 12, which define over the prior art, as discussed in detail above. Therefore, claims 2 – 7, 8, 10, 11, 13 – 18, 20, 21, 23 and 24 also define over the prior art and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner has stated that claims 6, 9, 19 and 22 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Although Applicants thank the Examiner for recognizing the allowable subject-matter of claims 6, 9, 19 and 22, Applicants have presently refrained from rewriting claims 6, 9, 19 and 22 in independent form in view of the amendments and discussion herein.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 9, 2004

By: 

Linda M. Deschere
Reg. No. 34,811

Ryan P. McCarthy
Reg. No. 50,636

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600